



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

JONATHAN P. O'BRIEN, PH.D.  
HONIGMAN MILLER  
SCHWARTZ AND COHN  
350 EAST MICHIGAN AVENUE  
SUITE 300  
KALAMAZOO MI 49007

**COPY MAILED**

MAR 12 2010

In re Application of	:	
Adamson	:	
Application No. 10/589,088	:	DECISION
Filed/Deposited: 10 August, 2006	:	
Attorney Docket No. 126866-00008	:	

This is a decision on the petition filed on 17 November, 2009, to revive an application under 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) as having been abandoned due to unintentional delay.

*Contemporaneously with the submission of the petition, Petitioner appears to have submitted a request and fee for extension of time in an attempt to extend the date of abandonment forward from after midnight 30 June, 2009.*

*This is not appropriate.*

*When an application is abandoned at the shortened statutory period because no attempt was made timely to extend to the statutory maximum and provide a proper and timely reply, it is not possible to do so retroactively. The fee is refunded.*

*It also is noted that it is unnecessary in the present context for Petitioner to supplement the statement of unintentional delay above that already present in the petition form as provided by the Office.*

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **GRANTED**.

As to the Allegations  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

*The attentions of all Petitioner always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II).*

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 30 March, 2009, with reply due absent an extension of time on or before 30 June, 2009.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 30 June, 2009.

The Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 14 October, 2009.

On 17 November, 2009, Petitioner filed, *inter alia*, a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), with fee, with a reply in the form of an amendment, and a statement of unintentional delay.

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to disclose.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

### STATUTES, REGULATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).<sup>2</sup>

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application under this congressional grant of authority.

Unintentional delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.<sup>3</sup>))

#### As to Allegations of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

It appears that the requirements under the rule have been satisfied.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **granted**.

The instant application is released to the Technology Center/AU 1793 for further processing in due course.

Petitioner may find it beneficial to view Private PAIR within a fortnight of the instant decision to ensure that the revival has been acknowledged by the TC/AU in response to this decision. It is noted that all inquiries with regard to that change in status need be directed to the TC/AU where that change of status must be effected—that does not occur in the Office of Petitions.

---

<sup>2</sup> 35 U.S.C. §133 provides:

**35 U.S.C. §133 Time for prosecuting application.**

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Commissioner in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that such delay was unavoidable.

<sup>3</sup> Therefore, by example, an unintentional delay in the reply might occur if the reply and transmittal form are to be prepared for shipment by the US Postal Service, but other pressing matters distract one's attention and the mail is not timely deposited for shipment.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2<sup>4</sup>) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./  
John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

---

<sup>4</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

**§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.